arXiv:0901.1114v1 [math.NT] 8 Jan 2009

GENERALIZED GOLDEN RATIOS OF TERNARY ALPHABETS

VILMOS KOMORNIK, ANNA CHIARA LAI, AND MARCO PEDICINI

Abstract. Expansions in noninteger bases often appear in number theory and probability theory, and they are closely connected to ergodic theory, measure theory and topology. For two-letter alphabets the golden ratio plays a special role: in smaller bases only trivial expansions are unique, whereas in greater bases there exist nontrivial unique expansions. In this paper we determine the corresponding critical bases for all three-letter alphabets and we establish the fractal nature of these bases in function of the alphabets.

1. Introduction

Since the appearence of Rényi's β-expansions [11] many works were devoted to expansions in noninteger bases. Much research was stimulated by the discovery of Erdős, Horváth and Joó [3] who proved the existence of many real numbers $1 < q < 2$ for which only one sequence (c_i) of zeroes and ones satisfies the equality

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_i}{q^i} = 1.$$

The set of such "univoque" bases has a fractal nature, see, e.g., [4], [6], [8], where arbitrary bases $q > 1$ are also considered.

Contrary to the integer case, in a given noninteger base $q > 1$ a real number x may have sometimes many different expansions of the form

$$\pi_q(c) := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_i}{q^i} = x \tag{1.1}$$

with integer "digits" satisfying $0 \le c_i < q$ for every i. On the other hand, the set of numbers x having a unique expansion has many unexpected topological and combinatorial properties, depending on the value of q; see, e.g., Daróczy and Kátai [1], Glendinning and Sidorov [5], and [2].

Given a finite alphabet $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_J\}$ of real numbers $a_1 < \dots < a_J$ and a real number $q > 1$, by an expansion of a real number x we mean a sequence (c_i) of numbers $c_i \in A$ satisfying (1.1). The expansions of

$$x_1 := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_1}{q^i} \quad \text{and} \quad x_2 := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_J}{q^i}$$

are always unique; they are called the trivial unique expansions.

For two-letter alphabets $A = \{a_1, a_2\}$ the golden ratio $p := (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ plays a special role: there exist nontrivial unique expansions in base q if and only if $q > p$.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 11A63, Secondary: 11B83.

Key words and phrases. Golden ratio, ternary alphabet, unique expansion, noninteger base, beta-expansion, greedy expansion, lazy expansion, univoque sequence.

The purpose of this paper is to determine analogous critical bases for each ternary alphabet $A = \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$. Our main tool is a lexicographic characterization of unique expansions, given in [10], which generalized for arbitrary finite alphabets a theorem of Parry [9] and its various extensions [1], [3], [4], [7].

By a normalization it suffices to consider the alphabets $A_m := \{0, 1, m\}$ with $m \ge 2$. Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *There exists a continuous function* $p : [2, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$, $m \mapsto p_m$ *satisfying*

$$2 \le p_m \le P_m := 1 + \sqrt{\frac{m}{m-1}}$$

for all m *such that the following properties hold true:*

(a) for each $m \ge 2$*, there exist nontrivial unique expansions if and only if* $q > p_m$*;*

(b) we have $p_m = 2$ *if and only if* $m = 2^k$ *for some positive integer* k*;*

(c) the set $C := \{m \ge 2 \ : \ p_m = P_m\}$ *is a Cantor set, i.e., an uncountable closed set having neither interior nor isolated points; its smallest element is* $1+x \approx 2.3247$ *where* x *is the first Pisot number, i.e., the positive root of the equation* $x^3 = x + 1$*;*

(d) each connected component (m_d, M_d) *of* $[2, \infty) \setminus C$ *has a point* μ_d *such that* p *is strictly decreasing in* $[m_d, \mu_d]$ *and strictly increasing in* $[\mu_d, M_d]$*.*

Moreover, we will determine explicitly the function p and the numbers m_d, M_d, μ_d.

In Section 2, we review some basic facts about expansions and we also give some new results. In Sections 3–4 we introduce the class of *admissible sequences* and we clarify their structure and their basic properties. These results allow us to determine in Section 5 the critical bases for all ternary alphabets.

2. Some results on arbitrary alphabets

Throughout this section we consider a fixed finite alphabet $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_J\}$ of real numbers $a_1 < \cdots < a_J$. Given a real number $q > 1$, by an expansion of a real number x we mean a sequence (c_i) of numbers $c_i \in A$ satisfying the equality

$$\pi_q(c) := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_i}{q^i} = x.$$

In order to have an expansion, x must belong to the interval $[\frac{a_1}{q-1}, \frac{a_J}{q-1}]$. Conversely, we recall from [10] the following results:

Theorem 2.1. *Every* $x \in [\frac{a_1}{q-1}, \frac{a_J}{q-1}]$ *has at least one expansion in base* q *if and only if*

$$1 < q \le Q_A := 1 + \frac{a_J - a_1}{\max_{j>1}\{a_j - a_{j-1}\}} (\le J). \tag{2.1}$$

A sequence $(c_i) \in A^\infty$ is called *univoque* in base q if

$$x := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_i}{q^i}$$

has no other expansion in this base. The constant sequences $(a_1)^\infty$ and $(a_J)^\infty$ are univoque in every base q: they are called the *trivial unique expansions.* We also recall from [10] the following characterization of unique expansions:

Theorem 2.2. *Assume* (2.1). *An expansion* (c_i) *is unique in base* q *if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_{n+i} - a_1}{q^i} < a_{j+1} - a_j \quad \textit{whenever} \quad c_n = a_j < a_J;$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_J - c_{n+i}}{q^i} < a_j - a_{j-1} \quad \textit{whenever} \quad c_n = a_j > a_1.$$

Proof of the sufficiency. We have to show that if (d_i) is another sequence in A then it represents a different sum. Let $n \ge 1$ be the first index such that $c_n \ne d_n$. If $c_n < d_n$, then writing $c_n = a_j$ we have $a_j < a_J$, so that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i}{q^i} - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_i}{q^i} \ge \frac{a_{j+1} - a_j}{q^n} - \sum_{i=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{a_1 - c_i}{q^i} > 0$$

by our assumption. If $c_n > d_n$, then writing $c_n = a_j$ we have $a_j > a_1$, so that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_i}{q^i} - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i}{q^i} \ge \frac{a_j - a_{j-1}}{q^n} + \sum_{i=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{c_i - a_J}{q^i} > 0$$

by our second assumption. ☐

Proof of the necessity. If the first condition is not satisfied for some $c_n = a_j < a_J$, then by Theorem 2.1 there exists another expansion beginning with $c_1 \cdots c_{n-1} a_{j+1}$. If the second condition is not satisfied for some $c_n = a_j > a_1$, then by Theorem 2.1 there exists another expansion beginning with $c_1 \cdots c_{n-1} a_{j-1}$. ☐

Let us mention some consequences of this characterization.

Corollary 2.3. *For every given set* $C \subset A^\infty$ *there exists a number*

$$1 \le q_C \le Q_A$$

such that

$$q > q_C \Longrightarrow \ \textit{every sequence } c \in C \textit{ is univoque in base } q;$$

$$1 < q < q_C \Longrightarrow \ \textit{not every sequence } c \in C \textit{ is univoque in base } q.$$

Proof. If $C = \varnothing$, then we may choose $q_C = 1$. If C is nonempty, then for each sequence $c \in C$, each condition of Theorem 2.2 is equivalent to an inequality of the form $q > q_\alpha$. Since we consider only bases q satisfying (2.1), we may assume that $q_\alpha \le Q_A$ for every α. Then

$$q_C := \max\{1, \sup q_\alpha\}$$

has the required properties. ☐

Definition. The number q_C is called the *critical base* of C. If $C = \{c\}$ is a one-point set, then $q_c := q_C$ is also called the critical base of the sequence c.

Remark 2.1. If C is a nonempty finite set of eventually periodic sequences, then the supremum $\sup q_\alpha$ in the above proof is actually a maximum. In this case not all sequences $c \in C$ are univoque in base $q = q_C$.

Example 2.1. Consider the ternary alphabet $A=\{0,1,3\}$ and the periodic sequence $(c_i)=(31)^\infty$. By the periodicity of (c_i) we have for each n either $c_n=3$ and $(c_{n+i})=(13)^\infty$ or $c_n=1$ and $(c_{n+i})=(31)^\infty$. According to the preceding remark Theorem 2.2 contains only three conditions on q. For $c_n=3$ we have the condition

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\frac{3-c_{n+i}}{q^i}<2 \Longleftrightarrow \frac{2q}{q^2-1}<2,$$

while for $c_n=3$ we have the following two conditions:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\frac{3-c_{n+i}}{q^i}<1 \Longleftrightarrow \frac{2}{q^2-1}<1$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\frac{c_{n+i}}{q^i}<2 \Longleftrightarrow \frac{3}{q-1}-\frac{2}{q^2-1}<2.$$

They are equivalent approximatively to the inequalities $q>1.61803$, $q>1.73205$ and $q>2.18614$ respectively, so that $q_c\approx 2.18614$.

It is well-known that for the alphabet $A=\{0,1\}$ there exist nontrivial univoque sequences in base q if and only if $q>\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$. There exists a "generalized golden ratio" for every alphabet:

Corollary 2.4. *There exists a number* $1<G_A\leq Q_A$ *such that*

$$\begin{aligned} q>G_A &\Longrightarrow \text{ there exist nontrivial univoque sequences};\\ 1<q<G_A &\Longrightarrow \text{ there are no nontrivial univoque sequences.}\end{aligned}$$

Proof. If a sequence is univoque in some base, then it is also univoque in every larger base. If there exists a base satisfying (2.1) in which there exist nontrivial univoque sequences, then it follows that the infimum of such bases satisfies the requirements for G_A, except perhaps the strict inequality $G_A>1$. Otherwise we may choose $G_A:=Q_A$.

It remains to prove that if $q>1$ is sufficiently close to one, then the only univoque sequences are a_1^∞ and a_J^∞. We show that it suffices to choose $q>1$ so small that the following three conditions are satisfied:

$$\frac{a_J-a_1}{q-1}\geq a_{j+1}-a_{j-1},\quad j=2,\dots,J-1, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\frac{a_j-a_1}{q}+\frac{1}{q}\cdot\frac{a_J-a_1}{q-1}\geq (a_2-a_1)+\frac{a_j-a_{j-1}}{q},\quad j=2,\dots,J, \tag{2.3}$$

$$\frac{a_J-a_j}{q}+\frac{1}{q}\cdot\frac{a_J-a_1}{q-1}\geq (a_J-a_1)+\frac{a_{j+1}-a_j}{q},\quad j=1,\dots,J-1. \tag{2.4}$$

The proof consists of three steps. Let (c_i) be a univoque sequence in base q.

If $c_n=a_j$ for some n and $1<j<J$, then the conditions of Theorem 2.2 imply that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\frac{c_{n+i}-a_1}{q^i}<a_{j+1}-a_j \quad\text{and}\quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\frac{a_J-c_{n+i}}{q^i}<a_j-a_{j-1}.$$

Taking their sum we conclude that

$$\frac{a_J-a_1}{q-1}<a_{j+1}-a_{j-1},$$

which contradicts (2.2). This proves that $c_n \in \{a_1, a_J\}$ for every n.

If $c_n = a_1$ and $c_{n+1} = a_j > a_1$ for some n, then applying Theorem 2.2 we obtain that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_{n+i} - a_1}{q^i} < a_2 - a_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_J - c_{n+i+1}}{q^i} < a_j - a_{j-1}.$$

Dividing the second inequality by q and adding the result to the first one we obtain that

$$\frac{a_j - a_1}{q} + \frac{1}{q} \cdot \frac{a_J - a_1}{q-1} < (a_2 - a_1) + \frac{a_j - a_{j-1}}{q},$$

which contradicts (2.3). This proves that $c_n = a_1$ implies $c_{n+1} = a_1$ for every n.

Finally, if $c_n = a_J$ and $c_{n+1} = a_j < a_J$ for some n, then applying Theorem 2.2 we obtain that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_J - c_{n+i}}{q^i} < a_J - a_{J-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_{n+i+1} - a_1}{q^i} < a_{j+1} - a_j.$$

Dividing the second inequality by q and adding the result to the first one we now obtain that

$$\frac{a_J - a_j}{q} + \frac{1}{q} \cdot \frac{a_J - a_1}{q-1} < (a_J - a_{J-1}) + \frac{a_{j+1} - a_j}{q},$$

which contradicts (2.4). This proves that $c_n = a_J$ implies $c_{n+1} = a_J$ for every n. ☐

Definition. The number G_A is called the *critical base* of the alphabet A.

The following invariance properties of critical bases readily follow from the definitions; they will simplify our proofs.

Lemma 2.5. *The critical base does not change if we replace the alphabet A*

- *by $b + A = \{b + a_j \mid j = 1, \dots, m\}$ for some real number b;*
- *by $dA = \{da_j \mid j = 1, \dots, m\}$ for some nonzero real number d;*
- *by the* conjugate alphabet $A' := \{a_m + a_1 - a_j \mid j = 1, \dots, m\}$.

Proof. First we note that $Q_A = Q_{b+A} = Q_{dA} = Q_{A'}$. Fix a base $1 < q \le Q_A$ and a sequence (c_i) of real numbers. It follows from the definitions that the following properties are equivalent:

- (c_i) is an expansion of x for the alphabet A;
- $(b + c_i)$ is an expansion of $x + \frac{b}{q-1}$ for the alphabet $b + A$;
- (dc_i) is an expansion of dx for the alphabet dA;
- $(a_m + a_1 - c_i)$ is an expansion of $\frac{a_m + a_1}{q-1} - x$ for the alphabet A'.

Hence if one of these expansions is unique, then the others are unique as well. ☐

3. Admissible sequences

This section contains some preliminary technical results.

Definition. A sequence $d = (d_i) = d_1 d_2 \cdots$ of zeroes and ones is *admissible* if

$$0 d_2 d_3 \cdots \le (d_{n+i}) \le d_1 d_2 d_3 \cdots \tag{3.1}$$

for all $n = 0, 1, \dots$.

Examples 3.1.

- The trivial sequences 0^∞ and 1^∞ are admissible.
- More generally, the sequences $(1^N0)^\infty$ $(N = 1, 2, \ldots)$ and $(10^N)^\infty$ $(N = 0, 1, \ldots)$ are admissible.
- The sequence $(11010)^\infty$ is also admissible.
- The (not purely periodic) sequence 10^∞ is admissible.

In order to clarify the structure of admissible sequences we give an equivalent recursive definition. Given a sequence $h = (h_i)$ of positive integers, starting with

$$S_h(0,1) := 1 \quad \text{and} \quad S_h(0,0) := 0$$

we define the blocks $S_h(j,1)$ and $S_h(j,0)$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots$ by the recursive formulae

$$S_h(j,1) := S_h(j-1,1)^{h_j} S_h(j-1,0)$$

and

$$S_h(j,0) := S_h(j-1,1)^{h_j - 1} S_h(j-1,0).$$

Observe that $S_h(j,1)$ and $S_h(j,0)$ depend only on $h_1, \ldots, h_j$, so that they can also be defined for every finite sequence $h = (h_j)$ of length $\geq j$. We also note that $S_h(j,0) = S_h(j-1,0)$ whenever $h_j = 1$ and that the length ℓ_j of $S_h(j,1)$ tends to infinity as $j \to \infty$.

If the sequence $h = (h_j)$ is given, we often omit the subscript h and we write simply $S(j,1)$ and $S(j,0)$.

Let us mention some properties of these blocks that we use in the sequel. Given two finite blocks A and B we write for brevity

- $A \to B$ or $B = \cdots A$ if B ends with A;
- $A < B$ or $A \cdots < B \cdots$ if $Aa_1a_2 \cdots < Bb_1b_2 \cdots$ lexicographically for any sequences (a_i) and (b_i) of zeroes and ones;
- $A \leq B$ or $A \cdots \leq B \cdots$ if $A < B$ or $A = B$.

Lemma 3.1. *For any given sequence $h = (h_j)$ the blocks $S(j,1)$ and $S(j,0)$ have the following properties:*

(a) We have

$$S(j,1) = 1S(1,0) \cdots S(j,0) \quad \text{for all} \quad j \geq 0; \tag{3.2}$$

$$S(0,0) \cdots S(j-1,0) \to S(j,1) \quad \text{for all} \quad j \geq 1; \tag{3.3}$$

$$S(0,0) \cdots S(j-1,0) \to S(j,0) \quad \text{whenever} \quad h_j \geq 2; \tag{3.4}$$

$$S(j,0) < S(j,1) \quad \text{for all} \quad j \geq 0. \tag{3.5}$$

(b) If $A_j \to S(j,1)$ for some nonempty block A_j, then $A_j \leq S(j,1)$.

(c) If $B_j \to S(j,0)$ for some nonempty block B_j, then $B_j \leq S(j,0)$.

Proof.

(a) *Proof of* (3.2). For $j = 0$ we have $S(j,1) = 1$ by definition. If $j \geq 1$ and the identity is true for $j - 1$, then the identity for j follows by using the equality $S(j,1) = S(j-1,1)S(j,0)$ coming from the definition of $S(j,1)$ and $S(j-1,1)$.

Proof of (3.3) *and* (3.4). For $j = 1$ we have $S(0,0) = 0$ and $S(1,0) = 1^{h_1 - 1}0$, so that $S(0,0) \to S(1,0) \to S(1,1)$. (The condition $h_1 \geq 2$ is not needed here.)

Proceeding by induction, if (3.3) holds for some $j \geq 1$, then both hold for $j+1$ because

$$S(0,0)\cdots S(j-1,0)S(j,0) \to S(j,1)S(j,0) \to S(j+1,1),$$

and in case $h_{j+1} \geq 2$ we have also $S(j,1)S(j,0) \to S(j+1,0)$.

Proof of (3.5). The case $j=0$ is obvious because the left side begins with 0 and the right side begins with 1. If $j \geq 1$ and (3.5) holds for $j-1$, then we deduce from the inequality $S(j-1,0)\cdots < S(j-1,1)\cdots$ that

$$S(j,0)\cdots = S(j-1,1)^{h_j-1}S(j-1,0)\cdots < S(j-1,1)^{h_j}\cdots .$$

Since $S(j,1)$ begins with $S(j-1,1)^{h_j}$, this implies (3.5) for j.

(b) We may assume that $A_j \neq S(j,1)$; this excludes the case $j=0$ when we have necessarily $A_0 = S(0,1) = 1$. For $j=1$ we have $S(j,1) = 1^{h_1}0$ and $A_j = 1^t0$ with some integer $0 \leq t < h_1$, and we conclude by observing that $1^t0\cdots < 1^{h_1}\cdots$.

Now let $j \geq 2$ and assume that the result holds for $j-1$. Using the equality $S(j,1) = S(j-1,1)^{h_j}S(j-1,0)$ we distinguish three cases.

If $A_j \to S(j-1,0)$, then we have the implications

$$\begin{aligned} A_j \to S(j-1,0) &\Longrightarrow A_j \to S(j-1,1) \quad \text{and} \quad A_j \neq S(j-1,1) \\ &\Longrightarrow A_j\cdots < S(j-1,1)\cdots \\ &\Longrightarrow A_j\cdots < S(j,1)\cdots . \end{aligned}$$

If $A_j = A_{j-1}S(j-1,1)^tS(j-1,0)$ for some $0 \leq t < h_j$, $A_{j-1} \to S(j-1,1)$ and $A_{j-1} \neq S(j-1,1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} A_{j-1}\cdots < S(j-1,1)\cdots &\Longrightarrow A_j\cdots < S(j-1,1)\cdots \\ &\Longrightarrow A_j\cdots < S(j,1)\cdots . \end{aligned}$$

Finally, if $A_j = S(j-1,1)^tS(j-1,0)$ for some $0 \leq t < h_j$, then using (3.5) we have

$$A_j\cdots < S(j-1,1)^{t+1}\cdots$$

and therefore

$$A_j\cdots < S(j,1)\cdots .$$

(c) Proceeding by induction, the case $j=0$ is obvious because then we have necessarily $B_0 = S(0,0) = 0$. Let $j \geq 1$ and assume that the property holds for $j-1$ instead of j. If $h_j > 1$, then the case of j follows by applying part (b) with h_j replaced by $h_j - 1$. If $h_j = 1$, then we have $S(j,0) = S(j-1,0)$ and applying (b) we conclude that

$$B_j \to S(j,0) \Longrightarrow B_j \to S(j-1,0) \Longrightarrow B_j \leq S(j-1,0) = S(j,0). \qquad \square$$

The following lemma is a partial converse of (3.3).

Lemma 3.2. *If A is a block of length ℓ_{N-1} in some sequence $S(N,a_1)S(N,a_2)\cdots$ with $N \geq 1$ and $(a_i) \subset \{0,1\}$, then $A \geq S(0,0)\cdots S(N-1,0)$. Furthermore, we have $A = S(0,0)\cdots S(N-1,0)$ if and only if $A \to S(N,a_i)$ with some $a_i = 1$.*

Proof. The case $N = 1$ is obvious because then $S(0, 0) = 0$ implies that $A = 0$, and $S(1, 1) = 1^{h_1}0$ ends with 0.

Now let $N \geq 2$ and assume by induction that the result holds for $N - 1$. Writing $A = BC$ with a block B of the same length as $S(0, 0) \cdots S(N - 2, 0)$ and applying the induction hypothesis to B in the sequence

$$S(N, a_1)S(N, a_2) \cdots = \big(S(N - 1, 1)^{h_N - 1 + a_i} S(N - 1, 0)\big)$$

we obtain that $B \to S(N - 1, 1)$ for one of the blocks on the right side and thus $B = S(0, 0) \cdots S(N - 2, 0)$. Then it follows from our assumption that C has the same length as $S(N - 1, 0)$ and $C \leq S(N - 1, 0)$. Since $S(N - 1, 0) < S(N - 1, 1)$, the block containing B must be followed by a block $S(N - 1, 0)$. We conclude that $C = S(N - 1, 0)$ and therefore $A = BC = S(0, 0) \cdots S(N - 1, 0)$ and

$$A \to S(N - 1, 1)^{h_N - 1 + a_i} S(N - 1, 0) = S(N, a_i)$$

for some $a_i = 1$. □

Lemma 3.3. *A sequence $d = (d_i)$ is admissible if and only if one of the following three conditions is satisfied:*

- *$d = 0^\infty$;*
- *there exists an infinite sequence $h = (h_i)$ of positive integers such that d begins with $S_h(N, 1)$ for every $N = 0, 1, \ldots$;*
- *$d = S_h(N, 1)^\infty$ with some nonnegative integer N and a finite sequence $h = (h_1, \ldots, h_N)$ of positive integers.*

Proof. It follows from the definition that $d_1 = 1$ for all admissible sequences other than 0^∞. In the sequel we consider only admissible sequences beginning with $d_1 = 1$. We omit the subscript h for brevity.

Let $d = (d_i)$ be an admissible sequence. Setting $d_i^0 := d_i$ we have

$$d = S(0, d_1^0)S(0, d_2^0) \cdots$$

with the admissible sequence (d_i^0).

Proceeding by recurrence, assume that

$$d = S(j, d_1^j)S(j, d_2^j) \cdots$$

for some integer $j \geq 0$ with an admissible sequence (d_i^j) and positive integers $h_1, \ldots, h_j$. (We need no such positive integers for $j = 0$.)

If $(d_i^j) = 1^\infty$, then $d = S(j, 1)^\infty$. Otherwise there exists a positive integer h_{j+1} such that d begins with $S(j, 1)^{h_{j+1}} S(j, 0)$. Since the sequence (d_i^j) is admissible, we have

$$S(j, 0)S(j, 1)^{h_{j+1}-1} S(j, 0) \cdots \leq S(j, d_{n+1}^j)S(j, d_{n+2}^j) \cdots \leq S(j, 1)^{h_{j+1}} S(j, 0) \cdots$$

for all $n = 0, 1, \ldots$. This implies that each block $S(j, 0)$ is followed by at least $h_{j+1} - 1$ and at most h_{j+1} consecutive blocks $S(j, 1)$, so that

$$d = S(j + 1, d_1^{j+1})S(j + 1, d_2^{j+1}) \cdots$$

for a suitable sequence (d_i^{j+1}) of zeroes and ones. The admissibility of (d_i^j) can then be rewritten in the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
(3.6)\quad S(j,0)S(j+1,0)S(j+1,d_2^{j+1})S(j+1,d_3^{j+1})\cdots \\
\le S(j,d_{n+1}^j)S(j,d_{n+2}^j)\cdots \\
\le S(j+1,1)S(j+1,d_2^{j+1})S(j+1,d_3^{j+1})\cdots
\end{aligned}
$$

for $n=0,1,\dots$.

We claim that the sequence (d_i^{j+1}) is also admissible. We have $d_1^{j+1}=1$ by the definition of h_{j+1}. It remains to show that

$$
\begin{aligned}
S(j+1,0)S(j+1,d_2^{j+1})S(j+1,d_3^{j+1})\cdots \\
\le S(j+1,d_{k+1}^{j+1})S(j+1,d_{k+2}^{j+1})S(j+1,d_{k+3}^{j+1})\cdots \\
\le S(j+1,1)S(j+1,d_2^{j+1})S(j+1,d_3^{j+1})\cdots
\end{aligned}
$$

for $k=0,1,\dots$.

The second inequality is a special case of the second inequality of (3.6). The first inequality is obvious for $k=0$. For $k\ge 1$ it is equivalent to

$$
\begin{aligned}
S(j,0)S(j+1,0)S(j+1,d_2^{j+1})S(j+1,d_3^{j+1})\cdots \\
\le S(j,0)S(j+1,d_{k+1}^{j+1})S(j+1,d_{k+2}^{j+1})S(j+1,d_{k+3}^{j+1})\cdots
\end{aligned}
$$

and this is a special case of the first inequality of (3.6) because $S(j+1,d_k^{j+1})$ ends with $S(j,0)$.

It follows from the above construction that (d_i) has one of the two forms specified in the statement of the lemma.

Turning to the proof of the converse statement, first we observe that if d begins with $S(N,1)$ for some sequence $h=(h_i)$ and for some integer $N\ge 1$, then

$$
(3.7)\qquad d_n\cdots d_{\ell_N} < d_1\cdots d_{\ell_N-n+1}\quad\text{for}\quad n=2,\dots,\ell_N;
$$

this is just a reformulation of part (b) of Lemma 3.1.

If $d_1d_2\cdots$ begins with $S(N,1)$ for all N, then the second inequality of (3.1) follows for all $n\ge 1$ by using the relation $\ell_N\to\infty$. Moreover, the inequality is strict. For $n=0$ we have clearly equality.

If $d=S(N,1)^\infty$ for some $N\ge 0$, then d is ℓ_N-periodical so that the second inequality of (3.1) follows from (3.7) for all n, except if n is a multiple of ℓ_N; we get strict inequalities in theses cases. If n is a multiple of ℓ_N, then we have obviously equality again.

It remains to prove the first inequality of (3.1). If $d=S(N,1)^\infty$ for some $N\ge 0$, then we deduce from Lemma 3.2 that either

$$(d_{n+i}) > S(0,0)\cdots S(N-1,0)$$

or

$$(d_{n+i}) = S(0,0)\cdots S(N-1,0)S(N,1)^\infty.$$

Since

$$0d_2d_3\cdots = S(0,0)\cdots S(N-1,0)S(N,0)S(N,1)^\infty,$$

we conclude in both cases the strict inequalities

$$(d_{n+i}) > 0d_2d_3\cdots .$$

If $d_1d_2\cdots$ begins with $S(N,1)$ for all N, then

$$0d_2d_3\cdots = S(0,0)S(1,0)\cdots S(N,0)\cdots \le (d_{n+i})$$

by Lemma 3.2. $\square$

Definition. We say that an admissible sequence d is *of finite type* if $d = S_h(N,1)^\infty$ with some nonnegative integer N and a finite sequence $h = (h_1, \dots, h_N)$ of positive integers. Otherwise (including the case $d = 0^\infty$) it is said to be *of infinite type.*

Lemma 3.4. *Let $d = (d_i) \ne 1^\infty$ be an admissible sequence.*

(a) If $(d_i) = S(N,1)^\infty$ is of finite type (then $N \ge 1$ because $d \ne 1^\infty$) and $(d'_i) = (d_{i+1+\ell_N-\ell_{N-1}})$, then

$$(d'_{n+i}) \ge (d'_i) > (d_{1+i})$$

whenever $d'_n = 0$. Moreover, we have

$$(d'_i) = S(1,0)\cdots S(N-1,0)S(N,1)^\infty \tag{3.8}$$

and

$$(d_{1+i}) = S(1,0)\cdots S(N-1,0)S(N,0)S(N,1)^\infty. \tag{3.9}$$

(b) In the other cases the sequence $(d'_i) := (d_{1+i})$ satisfies

$$(d'_{n+i}) \ge (d'_i)$$

whenever $d'_n = 0$.

(c) We have $d' = d$ if and only if $d = \left(1^{k-1}0\right)^\infty$ for some positive integer k, i.e., $d = 0^\infty$ or $d = S(N,1)^\infty$ with $N = 1$.

Proof.

(a) The first inequality follows from Lemma 3.2; the proof also shows that we have equality if and only if n is a multiple of ℓ_N.

The relations (3.2) and (3.3) of Lemma 3.1 imply (3.8)–(3.9) and they imply the second inequality because $S(N,0) < S(N,1)$.

(b) The case $(d_i) = 0^\infty$ is obvious. Otherwise (d_i) begins with $S(N,1)$ for all $N \ge 0$ and $\ell_N \to \infty$, so that we deduce from the relation (3.2) of Lemma 3.1 the equality

$$0d_2d_3\cdots = S(0,0)S(1,0)\cdots .$$

On the other hand, it follows from Lemma 3.2 that for any $n \ge 0$ we have

$$(d'_{n+i}) \ge S(0,0)\cdots S(N-1,0)S(N,0)^\infty$$

for every $N \ge 0$. This implies that

$$(d'_{n+i}) \ge 0d_2d_3\cdots$$

for every $n \ge 0$. If $d'_n = 0$, then we conclude that

$$d'_nd'_{n+1}d'_{n+2}\cdots \ge 0d_2d_3\cdots$$

which is equivalent to the required inequality

$$d'_{n+1}d'_{n+2}\cdots \ge d_2d_3\cdots .$$

(c) It follows from the above proof that $d = d'$ if and only if $d = 0^\infty$ or $d = S(N,1)^\infty$ for some integer $N \geq 1$ and h such that $\ell_{N-1} = 1$. These conditions are equivalent to $d = \left(1^{k-1}0\right)^\infty$ for some positive integer k. □

Example 3.2. If $d = S(N,1)^\infty$ is an admissible sequence of finite type with $N \geq 1$ (i.e., $d \neq 1^\infty$) and $h_1, \dots, h_N \geq 1$, then there exists a smallest admissible sequence $\tilde{d} > d$. It is of infinite type, corresponding to the infinite sequence $h = h_1 \cdots h_{N-1} h_N^+ 1^\infty$ with $h_N^+ := 1 + h_N$. Observe that $\tilde{d} = S(N-1,1)d$ and hence $\tilde{d}' = d'$.

Lemma 3.5. *If $d = (d_i)$ is an admissible sequence, then no sequence (c_i) of zeroes and ones satisfies*

$$0d_2d_3 \cdots < (c_{n+i}) < d_1d_2d_3 \cdots \tag{3.10}$$

for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$.

Proof. The case $d = 0^\infty$ is obvious because then $0d_2d_3 \cdots = d_1d_2d_3 \cdots$. We may therefore assume that d begins with $S(N,1)$ for some $N \geq 0$ and for some $h = (h_i)$. It follows from the second inequality of (3.10) that (c_i) contains infinitely many zero digits. By removing a finite initial block from (c_i) if necessary we may assume henceforth that $c_1 = 0$. Only these assumptions will be used in the first three steps below.

First step. The sequence (c_i) cannot end with $S(N,0)^\infty$.

This is true for $h_1 = \cdots = h_N = 1$ because then we have $S(N,0) = 0$ and obviously $0^\infty \leq 0d_2d_3 \cdots$.

Otherwise there exists $1 \leq M \leq N$ such that $h_M \geq 2$ and $h_{M+1} = \cdots h_N = 1$. Then we have $S(M,0) = S(M+1,0) = \cdots = S(N,0)$ and using the relation (3.4) of Lemma 3.1 there exists n such that

$$\begin{aligned}(c_{n+i}) &= S(0,0) \cdots S(M-1,0) S(M,0)^\infty \\ &= 0d_2d_3 \cdots d_{\ell_N} S(N,0)^\infty \\ &< 0d_2d_3 \cdots\end{aligned}$$

because

$$1d_2d_3 \cdots d_{\ell_N} S(N,0)^\infty = S(N,1)S(N,0)^\infty$$

while d begins with either with $S(N,1)S(N,1)$ or with $S(N,1)S(N,0)S(N,1)$ by Lemma 3.3.

Second step. We have $(c_i) = B_0 \cdots B_N \left(S(N, c_j^N)\right)$ with some nonempty blocks $B_j \to S(j,0)$ and a suitable sequence $(c_j^N) \subset \{0,1\}$.

The case $N = 0$ is obvious because $c_i = S(0,c_i)$ for every i; since $c_1 = 0$ by assumption we may choose $B_0 = 0$. Let $N \geq 1$ and assume by induction that $(c_i) = B_0 \cdots B_{N-1} \left(S(N-1, c_j^{N-1})\right)$ for some blocks $B_j \to S(j,0)$ and a suitable sequence $(c_j^{N-1}) \subset \{0,1\}$.

Since $1d_2d_3 \cdots$ begins with $S(N,1) = S(N-1,1)^{h_N} S(N-1,0)$, each block $S(N-1, c_j^{N-1})$ is followed by at most h_N consecutive blocks $S(N-1,1)$.

If $N = 1$, then the above means that each digit is followed by at most h_1 consecutive one digits. On the other hand, since $0d_2d_3 \cdots$ begins with 01^{h_1-1}, each zero digit is followed by at least $h_1 - 1$ consecutive one digits. This implies that $(c_i) = B_1\left(S(1,c_j^1)\right)$ for some block $B_1 \to S(1,0)$ and a suitable sequence $(c_j^1) \subset \{0,1\}$.

If $N \ge 2$, then, since $0d_2d_3\cdots$ begins with

$$\begin{aligned}&S(0,0)\cdots S(N-1,0)S(N,0)\\ &\qquad\qquad = [S(0,0)\cdots S(N-2,0)]\, S(N-1,0)S(N-1,1)^{h_N-1}S(N-1,0)\end{aligned}$$

and since

$$S(0,0)\cdots S(N-2,0) \to S(N-1,1)$$

by Lemma 3.1, each block $S(N-1,1)S(N-1,0)$ in $\left(S(N-1,c_j^{N-1})\right)$ is followed by at least $h_N - 1$ consecutive blocks $S(N-1,1)$.

Since (c_i) cannot end with $S(N-1,0)^\infty$ by the first step, we conclude that $\left(S(N-1,c_j^{N-1})\right) = B_N\left(S(N,c_j^N)\right)$ for some block $B_N \to S(N,0)$ and a suitable sequence $(c_j^N) \subset \{0,1\}$.

Third step. We have

$$(c_{n+i}) = S(0,0)\cdots S(N-1,0)S(N,0)S(N,a_1)S(N,a_2)\cdots$$

for some n and for a suitable sequence $(a_j) \subset \{0,1\}$.

We already know from the second step that (c_i) ends with $\left(S(N,c_j^N)\right)$ for a suitable sequence $(c_j^N) \subset \{0,1\}$, and that there are infinitely many blocks $S(N,1)$ by the first step. Since $(c_{n+i}) < d \le S(N,1)^\infty$ for every $n \ge 0$, there are also infinitely many blocks $S(N,0)$. Therefore (c_i) ends with

$$S(N,1)S(N,0)S(N,a_1)S(N,a_2)\cdots$$

and our claim follows because $S(0,0)\cdots S(N-1,0) \to S(N,1)$ by Lemma 3.1.

Fourth step. We complete the proof of the lemma in the case $d = S(N,1)^\infty$. We deduce from the third step that

$$\begin{aligned}(c_{n+i}) &= S(0,0)\cdots S(N-1,0)S(N,0)S(N,a_1)S(N,a_2)\cdots\\ &\le S(0,0)\cdots S(N-1,0)S(N,0)S(N,1)^\infty\\ &= 0d_2d_3\cdots,\end{aligned}$$

contradicting our assumption on (c_i).

Fifth step. We complete the proof of the lemma in the case where d begins with $S(N,1)$ for every $N \ge 0$ for some $h = (h_i)$. We know from the second step that $(c_i) = B_0\cdots B_N\left(S(N,c_j^N)\right)$ with some nonempty blocks $B_j \to S(j,0)$. If $B_j \ne S(j,0)$ for at least one j, then we conclude by using Lemma 3.1 that

$$(c_i) < S(0,0)\cdots S(N,0)S(N,a_1)S(N,a_2)\cdots$$

for every sequence (a_i). Since $0d_2d_3\cdots = S(0,0)\cdots S(N,0)S(N,a_1)S(N,a_2)\cdots$ for a suitable sequence (a_i), this contradicts the first inequality in (3.10).

If $B_j = S(j,0)$ for all j, then (c_i) begins with $S(0,0)\cdots S(N,0)$ for every $N \ge 0$. This implies that $(c_i) = 0d_2d_3\cdots$, contradicting the first inequality in (3.10) again. □

Lemma 3.6. *If $d = (d_i) \ne 1^\infty$ is an admissible sequence, then no sequence (c_i) of zeroes and ones satisfies*

$$0(d_i') < (c_{n+i}) < 1(d_i') \tag{3.11}$$

for all $n = 1, 2, \ldots.$

Proof. If $d = 0^\infty$, then $d' = 0^\infty$ and the result is obvious. It is sufficient therefore to consider the case where $d = S_h(N,1)^\infty$ for some $N \geq 1$ and for some $h = (h_i)$, for otherwise we have $d = 1d'$ and we may apply the preceding lemma. It follows again from our assumptions that (c_i) contains infinitely many zero digits, and we may assume that $c_1 = 0$.

Observe that putting $h^+ := (h_1, \ldots, h_{N-1}, 1 + h_N)$, $1d'$ begins with $S_{h^+}(N,1)$. Therefore, repeating the first three steps of the preceding proof we obtain that

$$(c_{n+i}) = S_{h^+}(0,0) \cdots S_{h^+}(N-1,0) S_{h^+}(N,1) S_{h^+}(N,a_1) S_{h^+}(N,a_2) \cdots$$

for some n and for a suitable sequence $(a_j) \subset \{0,1\}$. This can be rewritten in the form

$$(c_{n+i}) = S_h(0,0) \cdots S_h(N-1,0) S_{h^+}(N,1) S_{h^+}(N,a_1) S_{h^+}(N,a_2) \cdots . \tag{3.12}$$

Since

$$1d' = S_{h^+}(N,1) S_h(N,1)^\infty,$$

it follows from (3.11)–(3.12) that

$$(c_{n+i}) = S_h(0,0) \cdots S_h(N-1,0) S_{h^+}(N,1) S_h(N,1)^\infty.$$

Since

$$S_h(0,0) \cdots S_h(N-1,0) \to S_h(N,1),$$

we conclude that

$$(c_{n'+i}) = S_h(0,0) \cdots S_h(N-1,0) S_h(N,1)^\infty$$

for some $n' \geq 1$. This, however, contradicts (3.11) because the right side is equal to $0d'$. ☐

4. m-ADMISSIBLE SEQUENCES

Throughout this section we fix an admissible sequence $d = (d_i) \neq 1^\infty$ and we define the sequence $d' = (d'_i)$ as in Lemma 3.4. Furthermore, for any given real number $m > 1$ we denote by $\delta = (\delta_i)$ and $\delta' = (\delta'_i)$ the sequences obtained from d and d' by the substitutions $1 \to m$ and $0 \to 1$. We define the numbers $p'_m, p''_m > 1$ by the equations

$$\sum_{i=1}^\infty \frac{\delta_i}{(p'_m)^i} = m - 1 \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^\infty \frac{m - \delta'_i}{(p''_m)^i} = 1 \tag{4.2}$$

and we put $p_m := \max\{p'_m, p''_m\}$.

Introducing the conjugate of δ by the formula $\overline{\delta'_i} := m - \delta'_i$ we may also write (4.1) and (4.2) in the more economical form

$$\pi_{p'_m}(\delta) = m - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_{p''_m}\left(\overline{\delta'}\right) = 1.$$

Let us also introduce the number

$$P_m := 1 + \sqrt{\frac{m}{m-1}}.$$

A direct computation shows that $P_m > 1$ can also be defined by any of the following equivalent conditions:

$$(P_m - 1)^2 = \frac{m}{m-1}; \tag{4.3}$$

$$\frac{m}{P_m} + \frac{1}{P_m}\left(\frac{m}{P_m - 1} - 1\right) = m - 1; \tag{4.4}$$

$$(m-1)P_m - m = \frac{m}{P_m - 1} - 1. \tag{4.5}$$

We begin by investigating the dependence of P_m, p'_m and p''_m on m. The following two lemmas establish in particular part (b) of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 4.1.

(a) The function $m \mapsto P_m$ is continuous and strictly decreasing in $(1, \infty)$.

(b) The function $m \mapsto p'_m - P_m$ is continuous and strictly decreasing in $(1, \infty)$, and it has a unique zero m_d.

(c) The function $m \mapsto p''_m - P_m$ is continuous and strictly increasing in $(1, \infty)$, and it has a unique zero M_d.

(d) The function $m \mapsto p'_m - p''_m$ is continuous and strictly decreasing in $(1, \infty)$, and it has a unique zero μ_d.

(e) The function $m \mapsto p_m$ is continuous in $(1, \infty)$, strictly decreasing in $(1, \mu_d]$ and strictly increasing in $[\mu_d, \infty)$, so that it has a strict global minimum in μ_d.

Proof.

(a) A straightforward computation shows that P is infinitely differentiable in $(1, \infty)$ and

$$P'(m) = \frac{-1}{2(m-1)\sqrt{m(m-1)}} < 0$$

for all $m > 1$.

(b) Since $\delta_i = 1 + (m-1)d_i$, we may rewrite (4.1) in the form

$$\frac{1}{m-1} + (p'_m - 1)\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i}{(p'_m)^i} = p'_m - 1. \tag{4.6}$$

Applying the implicit function theorem it follows that the function $m \mapsto p'_m$ is C^∞.

Differentiating the last identity with respect to m, denoting the derivatives by dots and setting

$$A := 1 + (p'_m - 1)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i}{i(p'_m)^{i+1}}\right) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i}{(p'_m)^i}\right),$$

we get

$$A\dot{p}'_m = \frac{-1}{(m-1)^2}.$$

Differentiating (4.3) we obtain that the right side is equal to $2(P_m - 1)\dot{P}_m$, so that

$$A\dot{p}'_m = 2(P_m - 1)\dot{P}_m.$$

Since $\dot{P}_m < 0$ and $2(P_m - 1) > 1$, it suffices to show that $A \in (0, 1)$. Indeed, then we will have $\dot{p}'_m/\dot{P}_m > 1$ and therefore $\dot{p}'_m < \dot{P}_m (< 0)$.

The inequality $A > 0$ follows by using (4.6):

$$A = (p'_m - 1)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i}{i(p'_m)^{i+1}}\right) + \frac{1}{(m-1)(p'_m - 1)} > 0,$$

while the proof of $A < 1$ is straightforward:

$$\begin{aligned} A &\le 1 + (p'_m - 1)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i}{(p'_m)^{i+1}}\right) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i}{(p'_m)^{i}}\right) \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{p'_m}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i}{(p'_m)^{i}}\right) \\ &< 1. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to show that $p'_m - P_m$ changes sign in $(1,\infty)$. It is clear from the definition that

$$\lim_{m\searrow 1} P_m = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{m\to\infty} P_m = 2. \tag{4.7}$$

Furthermore, using the equality $d_1 = 1$ it follows from (4.6) that

$$\frac{1}{m-1} \le p'_m - 1 \le 1 + \frac{1}{m-1};$$

hence

$$\lim_{m\searrow 1} p'_m = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{m\to\infty} p'_m = 1. \tag{4.8}$$

We infer from (4.7)–(4.8) that $\lim_{m\to\infty} p'_m - P_m = -1 < 0$. The proof is completed by observing that

$$p'_m - P_m \ge \frac{1}{m-1} - 1 - \sqrt{\frac{m}{m-1}} \to \infty > 0$$

if $m \searrow 1$.

(c) We may rewrite (4.2) in the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - d'_i}{(p''_m)^i} = \frac{1}{m-1}. \tag{4.9}$$

Applying the implicit function theorem it follows from (4.9) that the function $m \mapsto p''_m$ is C^∞.

The last identity also shows that the function $m \mapsto p''_m$ is strictly increasing. Using (a) we conclude that the function $m \mapsto p''_m - P_m$ is strictly increasing, too.

It remains to show that $p''_m - P_m$ changes sign in $(1,\infty)$. Since $d \ne 1^\infty$, there exists an index k such that $d'_k = 0$. Therefore we deduce from (4.9) the inequalities

$$\frac{1}{(p''_m)^k} \le \frac{1}{m-1} \le \frac{1}{p''_m - 1}$$

and hence that

$$\lim_{m\searrow 1} p''_m = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{m\to\infty} p''_m = \infty. \tag{4.10}$$

We conclude from (4.7) and (4.10) that

$$\lim_{m\searrow 1} p''_m - P_m = -\infty < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{m\to\infty} p''_m - P_m = \infty > 0.$$

(d) The proof of (b) and (c) shows that $m \mapsto p'_m$ is continuous and strictly decreasing and $m \mapsto p''_m$ is continuous and strictly increasing; hence the function $m \mapsto p'_m - p''_m$ is continuous and strictly decreasing. It remains to observe that $p'_m - p''_m$ changes sign in $(1,\infty)$ because (4.8) and (4.10) imply that

$$\lim_{m\searrow 1} p'_m - p''_m = \infty > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{m\to\infty} p'_m - p''_m = -\infty < 0.$$

(e) This follows from the definition $p_m := \max\{p'_m, p''_m\}$ and from the fact that $m \mapsto p'_m$ is continuous and strictly decreasing and $m \mapsto p''_m$ is continuous and strictly increasing. ☐

The following lemma is a variant of a similar result in [4].

Lemma 4.2. *Let (c_i) be an expansion of some number $s \le b-a$ in some base $q > 1$ on some alphabet $\{a,b\}$ with $a < b$. If*

$$c_{n+1}c_{n+2}\cdots \le c_1c_2\cdots \quad \textit{whenever} \quad c_n = a,$$

then we also have

$$\frac{c_{n+1}}{q^{n+1}} + \frac{c_{n+2}}{q^{n+2}} + \cdots \le \frac{s}{q^n} \quad \textit{whenever} \quad c_n = a.$$

Moreover, the inequality is strict if the sequence (c_i) is infinite and $(c_{n+i}) \ne (c_i)$.

Proof. Starting with $k_0 := n$ we define by recurrence a sequence of indices $k_0 < k_1 < \cdots$ satisfying for $j = 1, 2, \ldots$ the conditions

$$c_{k_{j-1}+i} = c_i \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, \ldots, k_j - k_{j-1} - 1, \quad \text{and} \quad c_{k_j} < c_{k_j - k_{j-1}}.$$

If we obtain an infinite sequence, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{c_i}{q^i} &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{k_j-k_{j-1}} \frac{c_{k_{j-1}+i}}{q^{k_{j-1}+i}} \\
&\le \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\Big(\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{k_j-k_{j-1}} \frac{c_i}{q^{k_{j-1}+i}}\Big) - \frac{b-a}{q^{k_j}}\Big) \\
&\le \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\Big(\frac{s}{q^{k_{j-1}}} - \frac{b-a}{q^{k_j}}\Big) \\
&\le \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\Big(\frac{s}{q^{k_{j-1}}} - \frac{s}{q^{k_j}}\Big) \\
&= \frac{s}{q^n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Otherwise we have $(c_{k_N+i}) = (c_i)$ after a finite number of steps (we do not exclude the possibility that $N = 0$), and we may conclude as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{c_i}{q^i} &= \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{k_j-k_{j-1}} \frac{c_i}{q^{k_{j-1}+i}}\Big) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_{k_N+i}}{q^{k_N+i}} \\
&\le \sum_{j=1}^{N} \Big(\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{k_j-k_{j-1}} \frac{c_i}{q^{k_{j-1}+i}}\Big) - \frac{b-a}{q^{k_j}}\Big) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_i}{q^{k_N+i}} \\
&\le \sum_{j=1}^{N} \Big(\frac{s}{q^{k_{j-1}}} - \frac{b-a}{q^{k_j}}\Big) + \frac{s}{q^{k_N}} \\
&\le \sum_{j=1}^{N} \Big(\frac{s}{q^{k_{j-1}}} - \frac{s}{q^{k_j}}\Big) + \frac{s}{q^{k_N}} \\
&= \frac{s}{q^n}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last property follows from the above proof. □

Now we investigate the mutual positions of m_d, M_d and μ_d.

Lemma 4.3.

(a) If d is of finite type, then $m_d < \mu_d < M_d$, and $p_m < P_m$ for all $m_d < m < M_d$. Furthermore, $p_m \ge 2$ for all $m \in (1, \infty)$ with equality if and only if $d = \big(1^{k-1}0\big)^{\infty}$ and $m = 2^k$ for some positive integer k.

(b) In the other cases we have $m_d = \mu_d = M_d$ and $p_m \ge p_{\mu_d} = P_{\mu_d} > 2$ for all $m \in (1, \infty)$.

Proof.

(a) In view of Lemma 4.1 the first assertion will follow if we show that $p_m < P_m$ for $m := \mu_d$. Since $p_m = p'_m = p''_m$ in this case, using the relations (3.8)–(3.9) of Lemma 3.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
m - 1 &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta_i}{p_m^i} \\
&= \frac{m}{p_m} + \frac{1}{p_m} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta_{i+1}}{p_m^i} \\
&< \frac{m}{p_m} + \frac{1}{p_m} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta'_i}{p_m^i} \\
&= \frac{m}{p_m} + \frac{1}{p_m} \left(\frac{m}{p_m - 1} - 1\right).
\end{aligned}$$

In this computation the crucial inequality follows from Lemmas 3.4 and 4.2. Indeed, writing $d = S(N, 1)^{\infty}$, in view of the relations (3.8)–(3.9) of Lemma 3.4 the inequality is equivalent to

$$\pi_{p'_m}\big((\delta_{\ell_{N-1}+i})\big) < \pi_{p'_m}(\delta),$$

and this inequality follows from Lemma 4.2 with $c = \delta$, $q = p'_m$ and $n = \ell_{N-1}$. (The hypotheses of the lemma are satisfied because d is an admissible sequence.)

Using (4.4) we conclude that $p_m < P_m$ indeed.

Furthermore, for $m := \mu_d$ we deduce from the equalities

$$\pi_{p_m}(\delta) = m-1 \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_{p_m}\left(\overline{\delta'}\right) = 1$$

that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{m-\delta_i'+\delta_i}{p_m^i} = m.$$

It follows that $p_m \ge 2$ if and only if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{m-\delta_i'+\delta_i}{2^i} \ge m$$

which is equivalent to the inequality

$$\pi_2(\delta') \le \pi_2(\delta).$$

Since $\delta' \le \delta$ by Lemma 3.4, this is satisfied by a well-known property of diadic expansions.

The proof also shows that we have equality if and only if $\delta' = \delta$. By part (c) of Lemma 3.4 this is equivalent to $d = \left(1^{k-1}0\right)^{\infty}$ for some positive integer k. In this case we infer from the equations

$$\frac{m}{p_m'-1} - \frac{m-1}{(p_m')^k-1} = m-1$$

and

$$\frac{m}{p_m''-1} - \frac{m-1}{(p_m'')^k-1} = \frac{m}{p_m''-1} - 1$$

that $p_m' = p_m'' = m^{1/k} = 2$.

Since by Lemma 4.1 p_m has a global strict minimum in $m = \mu_d$, we have $p_m > 2$ for all other values of m.

(b) Putting $m = \mu_d$ and repeating the first part of the proof of (a), by Lemma 3.4 now we have an equality instead of the strict inequality; using (4.4) we conclude that $p_m = P_m$ and hence $p_m = p_m' = p_m'' = P_m$. Applying Lemma 4.1 we conclude that $m_d = \mu_d = M_d$. ☐

5. UNIVOQUE SEQUENCES IN SMALL BASES

In this section we determine the generalized golden ratio for every ternary alphabet $A = \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$. Putting

$$m := \max\left\{\frac{a_3-a_1}{a_2-a_1}, \frac{a_3-a_1}{a_3-a_2}\right\}$$

we will show that

$$2 \le G_A \le P_m := 1 + \sqrt{\frac{m}{m-1}}.$$

Moreover, we will give an exact expression of G_A for each m and we will determine the values of m for which $G_A = 2$ or $G_A = P_m$.

By Lemma 2.5 we may restrict ourselves without loss of generality to the case of the alphabets $A_m = \{0, 1, m\}$ with $m \ge 2$. Condition (2.1) takes the form

$$1 < q \le \frac{2m-1}{m-1};$$

under this assumption, that we assume henceforth, the results of the preceding section apply. For the sequel we fix a real number $m \ge 2$ and we consider expansions in bases $q > 1$ with respect to the ternary alphabet $A_m := \{0, 1, m\}$.

One of our main tools will be Theorem 2.2 which now takes the following special form:

Lemma 5.1. *An expansion* (c_i) *is unique in base* q *for the alphabet* A_m *if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_{n+i}}{q^i} < 1 \quad \textit{whenever } c_n = 0; \tag{5.1}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_{n+i}}{q^i} < m-1 \quad \textit{whenever } c_n = 1; \tag{5.2}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_{n+i}}{q^i} > \frac{m}{q-1} - 1 \quad \textit{whenever } c_n = 1; \tag{5.3}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_{n+i}}{q^i} > \frac{m}{q-1} - (m-1) \quad \textit{whenever } c_n = m. \tag{5.4}$$

Corollary 5.2. *We have* $G_{A_m} \ge 2$.

Proof. Let (c_i) be a univoque sequence in some base $1 < q \le 2$. We infer from (5.2) and (5.3) that $c_n \ne 1$ for every n. Since $m \ge q$, then we conclude from (5.1) that each 0 digit is followed by another 0 digit. Therefore condition (5.4) implies that each m digit is followed by another m digit. For otherwise the left-hand side of (5.4) would be zero, while the right-hand side is equal to one. Hence (c_i) must be equal to 0^∞ or m^∞. ☐

Lemma 5.3. *If* (c_i) *is a nontrivial univoque sequence in some base* $1 < q \le P_m$, *then* (c_i) *contains at most finitely many zero digits.*

Proof. Since a univoque sequence remains univoque in every larger base, too, we may assume that $q = P_m$. It suffices to prove that (c_i) does not contain any block of the form $m0$ or 10.

(c_i) *does not contain any block of the form* $m0$. If $c_n = m$ and $c_{n+1} = 0$ for some n, then we deduce from Lemma 5.1 that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_{n+i}}{P_m^i} > \frac{m}{P_m - 1} - (m-1) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_{n+i+1}}{P_m^i} < 1.$$

Hence

$$\frac{m}{P_m - 1} - (m-1) < \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_{n+i}}{P_m^i} = \frac{1}{P_m} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_{n+i+1}}{P_m^i} < \frac{1}{P_m},$$

contradicting one of our conditions on P_m above.

(c_i) *does not contain any block of the form* 10. If $c_n = 1$ and $c_{n+1} = 0$ for some n, then the application of Lemma 5.1 shows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_{n+i}}{P_m^i} > \frac{m}{P_m - 1} - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_{n+i+1}}{P_m^i} < 1.$$

Since $m \ge 2$, these inequalities imply those of the preceding step, contradicting again our condition on P_m. ☐

Next we select a particular admissible sequence for each given m. Given an admissible sequence $d \neq 1^\infty$ we set

$$I_d := \begin{cases} [m_d, M_d) & \text{if } m_d < M_d, \\ \{m_d\} & \text{if } m_d = M_d. \end{cases} \tag{5.5}$$

Lemma 5.4. *Given a real number $m \geq 2$ there exists a lexicographically largest admissible sequence $d = (d_i)$ such that using the notations of the preceding section we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta_i}{P_m^i} \leq m - 1. \tag{5.6}$$

Furthermore, we have $d \neq 1^\infty$ and $m \in I_d$.

Remark 5.1. The lemma and its proof remain valid for all $m \geq (1+\sqrt{5})/2$.

Proof. The sequence $d = 0^\infty$ always satisfies (5.6) because

$$\frac{1}{P_m - 1} \leq 1 \Longleftrightarrow \sqrt{\frac{m-1}{m}} \leq m - 1 \Longleftrightarrow 1 \leq m(m-1)$$

and the last inequality is satisfied for all $m \geq 2$ (and even for all $m \geq (1+\sqrt{5})/2$).

All other admissible sequences are defined by a finite or infinite sequence (h_j). If we add the symbol ∞ to the end of each finite sequence (h_j), then the lexicographic order between admissible sequences is equivalent to the lexicographic order between the corresponding sequences (h_j). Let us say that a sequence (h_j) is *suitable* if the corresponding admissible sequence satisfies (5.6). We are thus looking for the largest suitable sequence (h_j).

If 1∞ is not suitable, then $d = 0^\infty$ is the largest admissible sequence satisfying (5.6).

If 1∞ is suitable, then there exists a largest positive integer h_1 for which $h_1 1^\infty$ is suitable. For otherwise $d = 1^\infty$ would satisfy (5.6) which is impossible because for $d = 1^\infty$ the right side of (5.6) is equal to

$$\frac{m}{P_m - 1} = m - 1 + \frac{1}{P_m} > m - 1.$$

Proceeding by recurrence assume that we have already determined the largest positive integers $h_1, \ldots, h_N$ for some $N \geq 1$ such that $h_1 \cdots h_N 1^\infty$ is suitable. If $h_1 \cdots h_N \infty$ is suitable, then it is the largest suitable sequence. If not, then there exists a largest positive integer h_{N+1} such that $h_1 \cdots h_N h_{N+1} 1^\infty$ is suitable.

Continuing this recurrence, either we find a largest suitable sequence of the form $h_1 \cdots h_N \infty$ with $N \geq 1$ in a finite number of steps, or we construct a largest infinite suitable sequence (h_j).

Observe that $d \neq 1^\infty$ because for $d = 1^\infty$ using (4.3) we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta_i}{P_m^i} = \frac{m}{P_m - 1} = \sqrt{(m-1)m} > m - 1$$

so that (5.6) is not satisfied.

It remains to prove that $m \in I_d$. We distinguish three cases.

(a) If (d_i) is defined by an infinite sequence (h_j), then we already know that $p_m = p'_m = p''_m$ and that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta_i}{P_m^i} \le m-1.$$

It remains to show the converse inequality

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta_i}{P_m^i} \ge m-1. \tag{5.7}$$

It follows from the definition of (δ_i) that if we denote by (δ_i^N) the sequence associated with the admissible sequence defined by the sequence $h := h_1, \ldots, h_{N-1}, h_N + 1, 1, 1, \ldots$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta_i^N}{P_m^i} > m-1.$$

Since both (d_i) and (d_i^N) begin with $S(N-1,1)^{h_N}$ and since the length of this block tends to infinity, letting $N \to \infty$ we conclude (5.7).

(b) If $(d_i) = S(N,1)^\infty$ for some $N \ge 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}(e_i) :&= S(N-1,1)^{h_N+1} S(N-1,0) \left[S(N-1,1)^{h_N} S(N-1,0)\right]^\infty \\ &= S(N-1,1) S(N,1)^\infty\end{aligned}$$

does not satisfy (5.6), so that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon_i}{P_m^i} > m-1$$

where (ε_i) is obtained from (e_i) by the usual substitutions $1 \to m$ and $0 \to 1$.

Observe that now we have $e_1 e_2 \cdots = 1 d'_1 d'_2 \cdots$ and therefore (using the notations of the first page of the paper)

$$m-1 < \pi_{P_m}(\varepsilon) = \frac{m}{P_m} + \frac{1}{P_m} \pi_{P_m}(\delta').$$

It follows that

$$\pi_{P_m}(\delta') > (m-1)P_m - m = \frac{m}{P_m - 1} - 1$$

which is equivalent to $\pi_{P_m}\left(\overline{\delta'}\right) < 1$. Since we have $\pi_{p''_m}\left(\overline{\delta'}\right) = 1$ by the definition of p''_m, we conclude that $P_m > p''_m$.

Finally, since we have $\pi_{P_m}(\delta) \le m-1 = \pi_{p'_m}(\delta)$ by the definitions of (d_i) and p'_m, we have also $P_m \ge p'_m$.

(c) If $(d_i) = 0^\infty$, then we may repeat the proof of (b) with $(d'_i) = 0^\infty$ and $(e_i) = 10^\infty$. □

Example 5.1. Using a computer program we can determine the admissible sequences of Lemma 5.4 for all *integer* values $2 \le m \le 2^{16}$. For all but seven values the corresponding admissible sequence is of finite type with $N = 1$, more precisely $d = (1^{h_1}0)^\infty$ with $h_1 = [\log_2 m]$. For the exceptional values $m = 5, 9, 130, 258, 2051, 4099, 32772$ the corresponding admissible sequence is of finite type with $N = 2$ and $h_1 = [\log_2 m]$ as shown in the following table:

m	d	N	h
5	$(11011010)^\infty$	2	(2,2)
9	$(1110110)^\infty$	2	(3,1)
130	$(1^7 01^6 0)^\infty$	2	(7,1)
258	$(1^8 01^7 0)^\infty$	2	(8,1)
2051	$(1^{11} 01^{10} 0)^\infty$	2	(11,1)
4099	$(1^{12} 01^{11} 0)^\infty$	2	(12,1)
32772	$(1^{15} 01^{14} 0)^\infty$	2	(15,1)

Now we need two definitions. The *quasi-greedy* expansion of a real number x in some base q is its lexicographically largest infinite expansion in the alphabet $\{0,1,m\}$, while the *quasi-lazy* expansion of x is the *conjugate* $(m-c_i)$ of the quasi-greedy expansion (c_i) of $\frac{m}{q-1}-x$ with respect to the conjugate alphabet $\{0,m-1,m\}$. The following lemma follows at once from these definitions.

Lemma 5.5. *Let (c_i) be a sequence on the alphabet $\{0,1,m\}$ and $q>1$ a real number.*

(a) The sequence (c_i) is a quasi-greedy expansion of some x in base q if and only if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\frac{c_{n+i}}{q^i}\le 1 \quad \textit{whenever} \quad c_n=0$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\frac{c_{n+i}}{q^i}\le m-1 \quad \textit{whenever} \quad c_n=1.$$

Hence, if $c=(c_i)$ is a quasi-greedy expansion in base q, then $m^n c$ and (c_{n+i}) are also quasi-greedy expansions in every base $\ge q$, for every positive integer n.

(b) The sequence (c_i) is a quasi-lazy expansion of some x in base q if and only if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\frac{m-c_{n+i}}{q^i}\le 1 \quad \textit{whenever} \quad c_n=1$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\frac{m-c_{n+i}}{q^i}\le m-1 \quad \textit{whenever} \quad c_n=m.$$

Hence, if $c=(c_i)$ is a quasi-lazy expansion in base q, then $0^n c$ and (c_{n+i}) are also quasi-lazy expansions in every base $\ge q$, for every positive integer n.

(c) If $x\ge y$ and $p\ge q$, then the quasi-greedy (resp. the quasi-lazy) expansion of x in base p is lexicographically larger than or equal to that of y in base q.

Lemma 5.6. *Given an admissible sequence $d\ne 1^\infty$ and $m\in I_d$ let us define the sequences d', δ, δ' and the numbers p'_m, p''_m, p_m as at the beginning of Section 4.*

(a) The sequences δ, $m\delta'$ are quasi-greedy in base p_m.

(b) The sequences δ' and (δ_{1+i}) are quasi-lazy in base p_m.

Proof.

(a) Applying Lemma 4.2 with $(c_i) := \delta$ and $q = p'_m$ on the alphabet $\{1, m\}$ we obtain that δ satisfies the conditions of part (a) Lemma 5.5, so that it is a quasi-greedy expansion in base p'_m. Since $p_m \geq p'_m$, the second half of part (a) of Lemma 5.5 shows that δ and $m\delta'$ are quasi-greedy expansions in base p_m.

(b) Since $(\delta_{1+i}) = (\delta'_{k+i})$ for some $k \geq 0$, and since $1 \leq m-1$, in view of part (b) of Lemma 5.5 it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{m-\delta'_{n+i}}{(p''_m)^i} \leq 1 \tag{5.8}$$

for all $n \geq 1$.

First we observe that (5.8) is true for $n = 0$ by the definition of p''_m. Furthermore, it is also true if $n \geq 1$ and $\delta'_n = m$: this follows by applying Lemma 4.2 with $(c_i) := m - \delta'$ and $q = p''_m$ on the alphabet $\{0, m-1\}$.

If $n \geq 1$ and $\delta'_n = 1$, then let $0 \leq k < n$ be the largest integer satisfying $\delta_i = 1$ for all $k < i \leq n$. Then we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{m-\delta'_{k+i}}{(p''_m)^i} \leq 1$$

by the preceding paragraph. The proof will be complete if we show that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{m-\delta'_{n+i}}{(p''_m)^i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{m-\delta'_{k+i}}{(p''_m)^i}.$$

Since

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{m-\delta'_{k+i}}{(p''_m)^i} = \frac{m-1}{p''_m} + \cdots + \frac{m-1}{(p''_m)^{n-k}} + \frac{1}{(p''_m)^{n-k}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{m-\delta'_{n+i}}{(p''_m)^i},$$

this is equivalent to

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{(p''_m)^{n-k}}\right) \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{m-\delta'_{n+i}}{(p''_m)^i} \leq \frac{m-1}{p''_m} + \cdots + \frac{m-1}{(p''_m)^{n-k}}.$$

The last inequality is true because if we replace each δ'_{n+i} by the smallest possible value 1, then we obtain the right side. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}\left(1 - \frac{1}{(p''_m)^{n-k}}\right) \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{m-1}{(p''_m)^i} &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{m-1}{(p''_m)^i}\right) - \left(\sum_{i=n-k+1}^{\infty} \frac{m-1}{(p''_m)^i}\right) \\ &= \frac{m-1}{p''_m} + \cdots + \frac{m-1}{(p''_m)^{n-k}}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.7. *Denoting by* $\gamma = (\gamma_i)$ *and* $\lambda = (\lambda_i)$ *the quasi-greedy expansion of* $m-1$ *in base* p_m *and the quasi-lazy expansion of* $\frac{m}{p_m - 1} - 1$ *in base* p_m*, respectively, we have either*

$$(\delta_{1+i}) \leq \lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma = \delta$$

or

$$\delta' = \lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma \leq m\delta'.$$

Proof. If $p'_m \ge p''_m$, then both γ and δ are quasi-greedy expansions of $m-1$ in base $p_m = p'_m$ by Lemma 5.6, so that $\gamma = \delta$. Since furthermore both $\hat{\delta} := (\delta_{1+i})$ and λ are quasi-lazy expansions in base p_m, in view of Lemma 5.5 it remains to show only that $\pi_{p_m}(\hat{\delta}) \le \pi_{p_m}(\lambda)$. Since

$$m-1 = \pi_{p_m}(\delta) = \frac{m}{p_m} + \frac{1}{p_m}\pi_{p_m}(\hat{\delta})$$

and $p_m \le P_m$, using (4.5) we have

$$\pi_{p_m}(\hat{\delta}) = (m-1)p_m - m \le \frac{m}{p_m - 1} - 1 = \pi_{p_m}(\lambda).$$

If $p''_m \ge p'_m$, then both λ and δ' are quasi-lazy expansions of $\frac{m}{p_m-1} - 1$ in base $p_m = p''_m$ by Lemma 5.6, so that $\lambda = \delta'$. Furthermore $m\delta'$ and γ are quasi-greedy expansions in base p_m. Since $p_m \le P_m$, using (4.4) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_{p_m}(m\delta') &= \frac{m}{p_m} + \frac{1}{p_m}\pi_{p_m}(\delta')\\ &= \frac{m}{p_m} + \frac{1}{p_m}\left(\frac{m}{p_m-1} - 1\right)\\ &\ge m-1\\ &= \pi_{p_m}(\gamma).\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 5.5 we conclude that $m\delta' \ge \gamma$. □

Given $m \ge 2$ we choose an admissible sequence $d \ne 1^\infty$ satisfying $m \in I_d$ (see Lemma 5.4) and we define p_m as at the beginning of Section 4 (see Lemma 5.6). The following lemma proves part (a) of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 5.8.

(a) If $q > p_m$, then δ' is a nontrivial univoque sequence in base q.

(b) There are no nontrivial univoque sequences in any base $1 < q \le p_m$.

Proof.

(a) Since the sequence δ is quasi-greedy and the sequence δ' is quasi-lazy in base p_m and since δ' is obtained from δ by removing a finite initial block, δ' is both quasi-greedy and quasi-lazy in base p_m. Hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta'_{n+i}}{(p_m)^i} \le m-1 \quad \text{whenever} \quad \delta'_n = 1,$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{m-\delta'_{n+i}}{(p_m)^i} \le 1 \quad \text{whenever} \quad \delta'_n = 1,$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{m-\delta'_{n+i}}{(p_m)^i} \le m-1 \quad \text{whenever} \quad \delta'_n = m.$$

Since $q > p_m$, it follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta'_{n+i}}{q^i} < m-1 \quad \text{whenever} \quad \delta'_n = 1,$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{m-\delta'_{n+i}}{q^i} < 1 \quad \text{whenever} \quad \delta'_n = 1,$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{m-\delta'_{n+i}}{q^i} < m-1 \quad \text{whenever} \quad \delta'_n = m.$$

Applying Lemma 5.1 we conclude that δ' is a univoque sequence in base q.

(b) Assume on the contrary that there exists a nontrivial univoque sequence in some base $1 < q \le p_m$. Then it is also univoque in base p_m. Furthermore, since a univoque sequence in a base $\le P_m$ contains at most finitely many zero digits and since a univoque sequence remains univoque if we remove an arbitrary finite initial block, the there exists also a univoque sequence (η_i) in base p_m that contains only the digits 1 and m.

It follows from the lexicographic characterization of univoque sequences that

$$\eta_n = 1 \Longrightarrow (\lambda_i) < (\eta_{n+i}) < (\gamma_i)$$

and therefore (using the preceding lemma) that either

$$\eta_n = 1 \Longrightarrow (\delta_{1+i}) < (\eta_{n+i}) < (\delta_i)$$

or

$$\eta_n = 1 \Longrightarrow (\delta'_i) < (\eta_{n+i}) < m(\delta_i)$$

Setting $c_i = 0$ if $\eta_i = 1$ and $c_i = 1$ if $\eta_i = m$ we obtain a sequence (c_i) of zeroes and ones, satisfying either

$$(d_{1+i}) < (c_{n+i}) < (d_i) \quad \text{whenever} \quad c_n = 0 \tag{5.9}$$

or

$$(d'_i) < (c_{n+i}) < 1(d'_i) \quad \text{whenever} \quad c_n = 0. \tag{5.10}$$

The second inequalities imply that (c_i) has infinitely many zero digits. By removing a finite initial block if necessary we obtain a new sequence (still denoted by (c_i)) which begins with $c_1 = 0$ and which satisfies (5.9) or (5.10).

In case of (5.9) we claim that

$$0d_2d_3\cdots < (c_{n+i}) < (d_i) \quad \text{for all} \quad n \ge 0. \tag{5.11}$$

Indeed, if $c_n = 1$ for some n then there exist $m < n \le M$ such that $c_m = c_{M+1} = 0$ and $c_{m+1} = \cdots = c_M = 1$. In case of (5.9) it follows that

$$(c_{n+i}) \le (c_{m+i}) < (d_i)$$

and

$$(c_{n+i}) \ge (c_{M+i}) = 0(c_{M+1+i}) > 0(d_{1+i}) = 0d_2d_3\cdots.$$

However, (5.11) contradicts Lemma 3.5.

In case of (5.10) we claim that

$$0(d'_i) < (c_{n+i}) < 1(d'_i) \quad \text{for all} \quad n \ge 0. \tag{5.12}$$

Indeed, if $c_n = 1$ for some n then there exist $m < n \le M$ such that $c_m = c_{M+1} = 0$ and $c_{m+1} = \cdots = c_M = 1$; then we have

$$(c_{n+i}) \le (c_{m+i}) < 1(d'_i)$$

and

$$(c_{n+i}) \ge (c_{M+i}) = 0(c_{M+1+i}) > 0(d'_i).$$

However, (5.12) contradicts Lemma 3.6. □

The following lemma completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 5.9.

(a) If $d < \tilde{d} < 1^\infty$ are admissible sequences, then $M_d \le m_{\tilde{d}}$ with equality if and only if $d = S(N,1)^\infty$ is of finite type and $\tilde{d} = S(N-1,1)S(N,1)^\infty$.

(b) The sets I_d, where d runs over all admissible sequences $d \ne 1^\infty$, form a partition of the interval $[\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}, \infty)$.

(c) The set C of numbers $m > \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ satisfying $p_m = P_m$ is a Cantor set, i.e., a nonempty closed set having neither interior, nor isolated points. Its smallest element is $1 + x \approx 2.3247$ where x is the first Pisot number, i.e., the positive root of the equation $x^3 = x + 1$.

Proof.

(a) It suffices to prove that if $d < \tilde{d} < 1^\infty$ are admissible sequences *of infinite type*, then $M_d < M_{\tilde{d}}$. (We recall that $m_d = M_d$ and $m_{\tilde{d}} = M_{\tilde{d}}$ in this case.) Indeed, the general case hence follows by recalling from Example 3.2 and Lemma 5.6 that if $d = S(N,1)^\infty$ is of finite type, then $\tilde{d} = S(N-1,1)S(N,1)^\infty$ is the smallest admissible sequence satisfying $\tilde{d} > d$, and $m_d < M_d = m_{\tilde{d}} = M_{\tilde{d}}$.

Furthermore, it is sufficient to show that if $d < \tilde{d} < 1^\infty$ are admissible sequences *of infinite type*, then $p''_{d,m} > p''_{\tilde{d},m}$ for each $m \in (1,\infty)$ where $p''_{d,m}$ and $p''_{\tilde{d},m}$ denote the expressions p''_m of Section 4 for the admissible sequences d and $\tilde{d}$, respectively. Indeed, then we can conclude that $p''_{d,M_{\tilde{d}}} > p''_{\tilde{d},M_{\tilde{d}}} = P_{M_{\tilde{d}}}$ and therefore, since the function $m \mapsto p''_{d,m} - P_m$ is strictly increasing Lemma 4.1, $M_d < M_{\tilde{d}}$.

Assuming on the contrary that $p''_{d,m} \le p''_{\tilde{d},m}$ for some m, in base $q := p''_{\tilde{d},m}$ we have

$$\pi_q(m - \tilde{\delta}') = 1 = \pi_{p''_{d,m}}(m - \delta') \ge \pi_q(m - \delta') \Longrightarrow \pi_q(\delta') \ge \pi_q(\tilde{\delta}')$$

Since d and $\tilde{d}$ are of infinite type, we have $\delta = m\delta'$ and $\tilde{\delta} = m\tilde{\delta}'$ by Lemma 3.4, so that the last inequality is equivalent to $\pi_q(\delta) \ge \pi_q(\tilde{\delta})$.

Since quasi-greedy expansions remain quasi-greedy in larger bases, it follows from Lemma 5.6 that both δ and $\tilde{\delta}$ are quasi-greedy expansions in base q. Therefore we deduce from the last inequality that $\delta \ge \tilde{\delta}$, contradicting our assumption.

(b) The sets I_d are disjoint by (a) and they cover the interval $\left[\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}, \infty\right)$ by Lemma 5.4. In view of (a) the proof will be completed if we show that for the smallest admissible sequence we have

$$I_{0^\infty} = \left[\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}, 1 + P_1\right) \tag{5.13}$$

where $x > 1$ is the first Pisot number.

The values m_d and M_d are the solutions of the equations

$$\pi_{P_m}(\delta)=m-1 \quad\text{and}\quad \pi_{P_m}(\delta')=\frac{m}{P_m-1}-1.$$

Now we have $\delta=\delta'=1^\infty$, so that our equations take the form

$$\frac{1}{P_m-1}=m-1$$

and

$$\frac{1}{P_m-1}=\frac{m}{P_m-1}-1.$$

Using (4.3) we obtain that they are equivalent to $m=(1+\sqrt{5})/2$ and $m=1+P_1$, respectively.

(c) If we denote by D_1 and D_2 the set of admissible sequences $d\neq 1^\infty$ of finite and infinite type, respectively, then

$$C=[2,\infty)\setminus\cup_{d\in D_1}(m_d,M_d)$$

so that C is a closed set. The relation (5.13) shows that its smallest element is $1+P_1$. In order to prove that it is a Cantor set, it suffices to show that

- the intervals $[m_d,M_d]$ $(d\in D_1)$ are disjoint;
- for each $m\in C$ there exist two sequences $(a_N)\subset[2,\infty)\setminus C$ and $(b_N)\subset C\setminus\{m\}$, both converging to m.

The first property follows from (a). For the proof of the second property let us consider the infinite sequence $h=(h_j)$ of positive integers defining the admissible sequence d for which $m_d=m$, and set $d_N:=S_h(N,1)^\infty$, $N=1,2,\ldots$. This is a decreasing sequence of admissible sequences, converging pointwise to d. Using (a) we conclude that both (m_{d_N}) and (M_{d_N}) converge to $m_d=M_d$. Since $m_{d_N}\in D_1$ and $M_{d_N}\in D_2$ for every N, the proof is complete. $\square$

References

[1] Z. Daróczy, I. Kátai, *Univoque sequences*, Publ. Math. Debrecen 42 (1993), 3–4, 397–407.

[2] M. De Vries, V. Komornik, *Unique expansions of real numbers*, arXiv0609708 [math.], September 25, 2006; Adv. Math., to appear.

[3] P. Erdős, M. Horváth, I. Joó, *On the uniqueness of the expansions* $1=\sum q^{-n_i}$, Acta Math. Hungar. 58 (1991), 3–4, 333–342.

[4] P. Erdős, I. Joó, V. Komornik, *Characterization of the unique expansions* $1=\sum_{i=1}^\infty q^{-n_i}$ *and related problems*, Bull. Soc. Math. France 118 (1990), 3, 377–390.

[5] P. Glendinning, N. Sidorov, *Unique representations of real numbers in non-integer bases*, Math. Res. Lett. 8 (2001), 4, 535–543.

[6] V. Komornik, P. Loreti, *Unique developments in non-integer bases*, Amer. Math. Monthly 105 (1998), 7, 636–639.

[7] V. Komornik, P. Loreti, *Subexpansions, superexpansions and uniqueness properties in non-integer bases*, Period. Math. Hungar. 44 (2002), 2, 195–216.

[8] V. Komornik, P. Loreti, *On the topological structure of univoque sets*, J. Number Theory 122 (2007), 1, 157–183.

[9] W. Parry, *On the β-expansions of real numbers*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. 11 (1960), 401–416.

[10] M. Pedicini, *Greedy expansions and sets with deleted digits*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 332 (2005), 1–2, 313–336.

[11] A. Rényi, *Representations for real numbers and their ergodic properties*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. 8 (1957), 477–493.

Delft Institute of Applied Mathematics, Technical University of Delft, Mekelweg 4, 2628 CD Delft, The Netherlands, and Département de mathématique, Université de Strasbourg, 7 rue René Descartes, 67084 Strasbourg Cedex, France
E-mail address: `komornik@math.u-strasbg.fr`

Dipartimento Me.Mo.Mat., Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza", Via A. Scarpa, 16, 00161 Roma, Italy
E-mail address: `lai@dmmm.uniroma1.it`

Istituto per le Applicazioni del Calcolo "Mauro Picone", Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Viale del Policlinico, 137, 00161 Roma, Italy
E-mail address: `marco@iac.cnr.it`